DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 316 VT 013 611

TITLE	AVA Report.
INSTITUTION	American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	4 Dec 70
NOTE	66p.; Presentations at Post Secondary Education Seminar (New Orleans, La., December 4, 1970)
AVAILABLE FROM	American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions), *Evaluation, Occupational Guidance, *Post Secondary Education, Seminars, *Speeches, *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Career Education

ABSTRACT

This report contains the major presentations made at the American Vocational Association Convention, and also summarizes the group discussions which included conclusions and recommendations of the groups. Opening remarks were made by Mr. Lowell A. Burkett, with presentations including: (1) "Manpower Programs and Postsecondary Educational Institutions" by Charles O'Dell, (2) "Legislation for Career Education in Postsecondary Institutions" by Charles Radcliffe, (3) "Career Education" by Marvin Feldman, and (4) "The American Vocational Association and Its Commitment to Evaluation and Accreditation" by Joseph T. Nerden. A brief summary statement, made in lieu of an oral summary, by C. Nelson Grote is included. (GEB)

VT013611

ED053316

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

report

post
secondary
education
seminar
new orleans,
louisiana
december 4,
1970

INTRODUCTION

The last decade has witnessed a marked increase in the emphasis upon postsecondary technical and vocational education as a means for providing the occupational skills and knowledge demanded by our increasingly technological society. A major vehicle for the delivery of postsecondary technical and vocational education has been and continues to be the postsecondary institution identified variously as an area vocational school, a technical education center, a technical institute, or a community college. By whatever name, these institutions provide a variety of occupational education opportunities including pre-employment curricula, extension and upgrading programs, and manpower training for the unemployed or underemployed.

The increased demands upon and proliferation of postsecondary occupational education institutions have created a host of problems and issues. Among the more important of these are (1) federal legislation providing funds for pre-employment and manpower training and (2) the concommitant use of the academic concept of accreditation as a method of assessing the quality of a program or institution for the purpose of ensuring eligibility for funding. Other problem areas include the use of alternate and possibly competing delivery systems; articulation of secondary, postsecondary, and higher education; and the need for postsecondary occupational education to reach all the people who could benefit from it.

Recognizing its responsibility of leadership for <u>all</u> occupational education, and noting the absence of a forum at which these institutions could discuss their mutual problems and seek solutions to these problems, the American Vocational Association sponsored a pre-convention seminar on postsecondary occupational education prior to its annual convention held in New Orleans in December, 1970. Representatives of over 700 community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools throughout the United States were invited to this seminar. Also invited were state officials functioning in various capacities in postsecondary occupational education. Invited to the seminar as major speakers were persons with expert and intimate knowledge in the areas of manpower training, legislation affecting postsecondary occupational education, career education, and accreditation and evaluation of technical

and vocational education. Small group meetings were scheduled during the seminar to provide an opportunity for the participants to interact with the speakers and to allow the participants to discuss their mutual problems, express their concerns, and recommend possible solutions to existing problems.

While the seminar was apparently well received, its impact is as yet undetermined. Because of the complexity of the issues, much of the impact will necessarily be long-term. These seminar proceedings are published with the hope that wide dissemination will promote a better understanding of and appreciation for the issues and problems confronting postsecondary occupational education.

Acknowledgement is made and gratitude expressed to those seminar participants who made their presentations available for this report and to the group discussion chairmen and recorders who provided the materials emanating from the group discussions. Appreciation is also extended to J. K. Dane and Mrs. Sue King, editors for the Center for Occupational Education at North Carolina State University, for their expert help in editing the seminar transcripts, and to Mrs. Mary King, Center typist, for her help in typing the preliminary and final drafts.

Charles F. Ward
Seminar Editor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

OPENING REMARKS 4

Mr. Lowell A. Burkett

MANPOWER PROGRAMS AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS 7

Presentation by Mr. Charles Odell

LEGISLATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION IN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS 14

Presentation by Mr. Charles Radcliffe

CAREER EDUCATION 19

Presentation by Mr. Marvin Feldman

THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION AND ITS COMMITMENT TO EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION 30

Presentation by Dr. Joseph T. Nerden

GROUP DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 39

REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 51

Dr. C. Nelson Grote

APPENDIX A: SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS 54

OPENING REMARKS

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Association
Washington, D. C.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to welcome you here on behalf of the Board of Directors of the American Vocational Association. For some of you this may be your first time to attend an AVA convention. If so, we certainly hope that you will find this a very profitable and enjoyable experience. We want to make it as easy for you as possible to participate in the convention which begins tomorrow. You will find in your packets the invitations which are being extended in order that you may register for the convention if you so desire.

Our task in the field of vocational and technical education is very broad: It is that of providing the education and training that's needed for all people. This was stipulated in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, but it was not something new; to many of us in the field of vocational and technical education, it's something that we have always believed.

Certainly in providing a total program of vocational and technical education, our institutions--both public and private--have a major responsibility. Many of the institutions that are developing at this point in time are assuming a major role in this area, particularly the post-secondary institutions. Science and technology have advanced quite rapidly, and there is a need for us to provide education in all these types of institutions to meet the employment demands created by this scientific and technological advancement.

The American Vocational Association is an organization of teachers and administrators and others who are interested in the total program of technical and vocational education. We are not institutionally oriented; we are program oriented. We are concerned about the services, the education and the training needed to make people employable and to make them good citizens in our society.

The program of vocational-technical education operating in the public secondary and postsecondary school systems of

this nation is a very broad program, and those responsible for its operation are becoming more and more concerned about what happens in the thinking and the development of youth during their formative years in our elementary, junior high and secondary schools. While the program of vocational education had its beginnings in our secondary schools, during the last two decades and especially during the last decade the postsecondary schools have played a major role.

The total job of providing a program of technical-vocational education is much more than just the education and training offered in an institution. Many services to individuals must be provided, including effective guidance, placement, and follow-up. This requires the complete involvement of all the institutions and organizations which provide services to people. Because of this we felt it essential to have this opportunity to express to you, as the deans, the presidents, or the directors of these institutions, our interest and concern about a total program of vocational education.

As I said a moment ago our concern is very broad, that of providing the professional services needed to do the job. We did some research regarding the number of institutions at the postsecondary level that are offering associate degree programs in vocational and technical education, and we found that there are approximately 780 institutions of this type in the United States. We also know that there are over 1,500 area vocational-technical schools and technical institutes that are devoting their entire efforts to career development, and they are doing an outstanding job.

As a professional organization, we felt a need to extend our services in this area, and we have added to our staff a former dean of occupational-vocational education from one of our states in the South. His name is Mr. H. Dean Griffin. The area for which he will be responsible includes the various professional development activities, program improvement, and information and ideas regarding legislation related to vocational and technical education at the post high school level.

We look forward to the privilege of working with you, and we hope that you will want to work with us. Without the total efforts of all educators, we cannot provide the kind of an educational program that's needed by the youth

and adults of this nation, and we cannot provide an adequate manpower program. Because in my thinking, and I believe in the thinking of most of us in the field of vocational education, vocational education and manpower are not separate things; they are the same. I hope we deal with the problem in that manner.

In closing, I want to express to you our deep appreciation for your coming to this seminar, and hopefully, this experience will mean much to you. I'm sure it will mean much to us in the American Vocational Association.

Thank you very much.

MANPOWER PROGRAMS AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Charles Odell
Deputy Associate Manpower Administrator
Training and Employment Service
United States Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

I think the most profitable way I can address myself to the question of manpower programs as they relate to postsecondary educational institutions is to describe very briefly some of the provisions of a basic piece of legislation which is of real interest to this group and certainly to the American Vocational Association. I will then relate some of the basic provisions of that legislation to the whole matter of concern to this seminar, namely, postsecondary education of a technical and occupational nature.

There is a bill in conference committee between the Senate and the House called the Comprehensive Manpower Act, which addresses itself to bringing together the existing programs funded by the federal government in the general field, the generic field, of manpower. There are three basic pieces of legislation which are significantly impacted on and subsumed by the Comprehensive Manpower Act. The first is the Manpower Development and Training Act; the second includes those features of the Economic Opportunity Act having to do with manpower which have involved delegated programs to the Department of Labor; and the third is the basic enabling legislation for the United States Employment Service and the various state employment services, the Wagner-Preiser Act.

The intent of the Comprehensive Manpower Bill is to establish a decentralized and decategorized system for the development and implementation of manpower programs which are directed primarily to working with adults and those who have left school who are potentially in the job market. Many people in this category are not competitively employed or are underemployed because of barriers to employment related to race, cultural background, language difficulties and other problems which center on the whole issue of the disadvantaged and the poor in this country. The purpose of the legislation

is to bring together under prime sponsors at the local level the responsibility for putting together a comprehensive manpower plan for the community or the area, and to operate or at least oversee, the operation of such programs. The prime sponsors are identified in both bills as "responsibly elected public officials," whether they be mayors or county executives or others who may claim prime sponsorship. The "area" referred to in the legislation is presumably the labor market area, that is an area in which people move back and forth freely for purposes of employment. That, essentially, is what Title I of the Act addresses itself to. It is concerned primarily with the decentralization of the funding, the planning, the administration, and the overseeing of these programs.

Decategorization attempts to eliminate a whole series of specially funded, specially designed, frequently competing and overlapping programs which have a marvelous assortment of acronym names, ranging from the Neighborhood Youth Corps to the Concentrated Employment Program, STEP, SET, and a whole series of others which I won't go into. Essentially, decategorization pulls these programs together into a common program design which centers on reaching people who need help the most, providing them with the services, in terms of training and support, that they need to become employable, getting them employed, and helping them to stay on the job.

Now, this has been regarded by some in the educational field and some in the employment service field as the establishment of a dual or a competitive training and manpower delivery system. It is regarded by the sponsors and the designers of the bill as just the opposite, an attempt, really, to pull these delivery systems together, to develop a quality program in which those who are best able to contribute are given the opportunity to contribute whatever services they can and to be reimbursed for those services.

To those in vocational education who complain that the bill does not arbitrarily require that all these services must be delivered through a particular delivery system such as the vocational education program in the state and through that hierarchy, or to the people in the employment service who say that it's a bad program because it does not foreordain that all the services required in support, in counseling, testing and referral,

placement and follow-up, must be delivered by the employment services, the response is that we are looking for the best combination of sponsors, and we are willing to provide whatever funding resources are available to support the best combination of sponsors to see to it that a coordinated decentralized, decategorized program is delivered. I don't know what the fate of that bill, or those bills, will be. I have reason to believe that a compromise between the Senate and the House versions of the bill will be achieved in the conference committee and that we will have, before this session of Congress closes, a new comprehensive manpower act.

In the time remaining, I shall address myself to the challenge and the opportunity which I see in that legislation for people like yourselves who are concerned with certain aspects of career development, occupational, vocational and technical education, particularly at the postsecondary level. I interpret postsecondary to mean not only for those who have completed secondary education, but for those who are in the job market and who need certain kinds of additional training or educational support in order to become more competitively employable.

There is a very large and significant emphasis in this bill, in both the Senate and the House versions, on the whole matter of upgrading, which I consider to be one of the underutilized and misunderstood segments of our concern with manpower and career development. I can recall a conference of the National Manpower Advisory Committee about three years ago which was devoted almost exclusively to upgrading, and in which the principal advocates for upgrading were people like Whitney Young, people from the civil rights groups, and spokesmen for the black and Spanish-speaking community in this country. At that time those people said in effect that what we can do by way of riot-prevention with quickly funded and allocated resources to deal with manpower problems on a short-term, get-the-kid-a-job basis will not resolve the basic problems of underemployment and underutilization of large segments of our working population. The vast majority of the poor, they said, are employed. They may be underemployed, they may be part-time employed, but their problem is that they are locked into a bottomless pit of frustration and consternation over the fact that they really can't make it, in the kind of job they're in, either from an economic point of view or from an occupational point of view. Until we do something to target

in on the problem of upgrading and creative utilization of that employed group, we really will not be significantly resolving the problems of poverty, or opening up new opportunities for those who enter at the bottom and want to move up in an organization.

I can think of no more important and no more significant resource for dealing effectively with the problem of upgrading than the resource that I understand to be congregated in this room. We have not used it effectively; we have not tapped in, except in a very specialized and kind of esoteric way, to the resource which you represent in the upgrading field. We have programs, for example, very small in size and very limited in impact, called New Careers Programs, in which we attempt to relate career development from an entry level in a public service job to certification, if you will, or credential-seeking through a relationship with a community or junior college, or a technical program of some kind which provides related instruction to improve the competitive place of the person enrolled in the New Careers Programs. As I see an effective upgrading program, it will have to draw in an ever-widening circle and in an ever more intensive way, on that kind of resource, on a planned and structured basis, which not only changes the face and character of the educational system which is providing that kind of service, but which also works with equal or perhaps greater vigor in restructuring job ladders and in redesigning and restructuring employment opportunities to insure that there is upward mobility and an opportunity for upward movement within industry--and more important--in the public sector of our society.

A second major area is the whole area of career development for people who will be working in manpower programs and in related public service employment, which is a major feature of the Comprehensive Manpower Act. The central and controversial issue in that bill is the level and nature of public service employment. I happen to have some basic differences with the people in my own organization and in the Administration over the way in which we have addressed ourselves to the public service employment issue. Rather than resisting and arguing against it on the grounds that it is simply another form of income maintenance or income transfer, we really ought to be looking at the fact that the really significant and expanding segment of the economy is the public service

sector--federal, state, and local, and particularly state and local. This is very dramatically brought out in one of our own publications which I hope will be here on display with the Department of Labor exhibit at this convention, called U. S. Manpower in the 1970's. If we were really to look at the public service sector from the point of view of its opportunity-creating potential, not only in terms of the emerging fields of concern such as ecology and environment, but in terms of the jobs that are going essentially by default to people who really don't need them as badly as some others do who could get them if they were helped to qualify to move in and move up, it seems to me we could make a very real dent in the problem of poverty, in the problem of hard-core unemployment, and in the problem of underutilization of large numbers of people.

This is not to say that we turn the public sector into a dumping ground for the unqualified; it is to say that we turn the public sector into a sector which is responsive to the needs of the people it's supposed to serve. The public sector should lead the way and demonstrate its capacity to utilize people and provide job opportunities which have a future and which offer a significant amount of stability and upward mobility for those who are willing not only to come in at the bottom, but to credentialize themselves through related education and support over a period of time.

In the manpower business itself, I'm very glad to hear Mr. Burkett say that he doesn't want to dissociate manpower training from vocational, technical and occupational education. I'm very supportive of that notion, and I call your attention to the fact that as we decentralize and decategorize manpower programs under the Comprehensive Manpower Act, we clearly are going to need to draw heavily on the resources in vocational, occupational and technical education--not only for training in your traditional role, but for administrative, supervisory, and support personnel to make them work effectively. We have been doing some of this in New Careers. We have been doing some of it in our own efforts to do something about public service employment within our own organization, but we have really only begun to design models out of which a very significant development could occur if we were to pursue with some vigor and real commitment the potential that lies within our own organizations for this kind of opportunity.

A final point I would make--because I think it would be a mistake not to mention it--is that I spent all day yesterday in the executive session of the Senate Finance Committee where another bill which has profound manpower, vocational and technical and occupational education implications--the Family Assistance Act--was under discussion. Here again there is tremendous potential. I don't think we will get a family assistance bill in this session of Congress, primarily because time will probably run out over the controversial issues that are still involved in the family assistance bill. I think, however, we will have a family assistance program of very significant size and dimension within the next two years. In that program there is an infinite potential for creative manpower utilization and career development for welfare recipients and for the poor.

We cannot carry out that potential, we cannot begin to even address it without maximally tapping in to the existing vocational, technical and occupational education resources of this country. If the bill were to pass in its present form we would need an additional fifteen to twenty thousand people in the employment service system alone, half of whom ought to be preprofessionals who are recruited and trained from among welfare recipients. These persons should be trained both on and off the job to take on significant roles and be ultimately permitted to become professionals through a bridging arrangement which upgrades them and accepts them in the basic merit system under which they're operating. We would need at least that many, or twice that number, of professionally and preprofessionally trained daycare or childcare workers. We would need at least that many, if not twice that many, additional new federal employees to handle the income maintenance aspects of the Family Assistance Program. If we do not see the opportunity that exists for drawing from the welfare rolls, from the disadvantaged and the hard-core itself, at least 50 percent of the people who ultimately fulfill those responsibilities under a program like the Family Assistance Program, I think we will have made a tremendous mistake--not only in terms of reducing the numbers on welfare, but in terms of creating a responsive and related role between those who are administering these programs and those who are supposed to be the beneficiaries but too frequently are the victims of insensitive and unresponsive middle-class values that don't relate at all to the client's problems.

So in all this I see a tremendous challenge to you and a tremendous opportunity. I hope that when we begin to call for a positive response under the Comprehensive Manpower Act and Family Assistance Program and under the ongoing Manpower Programs, that we can count on you, not only to be receptive, but perhaps to be aggressively concerned about how you can get involved. The challenge and the opportunity are there. I hope we are up to it.

LEGISLATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION IN POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Charles Radcliffe
Minority Counsel for the Committee
on Education and Labor
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

I assume that this audience doesn't want to bother talking about 25 percent minimums or 15 percent set-asides, or whatever we have in the existing vocational education legislation. There actually isn't enough federal legislation in the field of postsecondary occupational education to merit lengthy discussion. What I would like to talk about, then, is the Congressional frame of mind, or the Congressional frame of reference, if you like, for the development of legislation in this field.

I think the first thing that I have to do--and I've given this considerable thought--is to chart the dimensions of our needs in this field. Some, if not all of you, are going to say that this is an exercise in quantifying the obvious, but I feel that it really isn't. While everybody knows that we have enormous needs in this field, the dimensions of those needs are not so obvious. They are, however, enormous; and when you talk about the total needs and look at the resources brought to bear on those needs you can only conclude that existing resources are terribly inadequate. I want to use another word. From the point of view of public policy and of our country, they're dangerously inadequate; unacceptably inadequate.

Our sixteen- to twenty-four year population numbers about 28,000,000. Of these, 16,000,000 in an average month are in the civilian labor force. What I'd like for you to consider, keeping in mind just that universe, is the extent of our educational training capacity.

Starting at the high school level, only about 4,000,000 of our high school students have any vocational education. I want to say this candidly, not critically of vocational education, because I think everybody that I know on this platform and some of you perhaps in the audience, knows that I, among others, have worked for a good many years

to help to vastly increase the federal input into vocational-technical education. I think I can say that I'm a friend of vocational-technical education, so I'm not being critical. But of the 4,000,000 of our high school students receiving some vocational education, I doubt if as many as one in five graduate with entry-level skills in any occupation. I'll leave it at that, and somebody can quarrel with it later. This means that we must rely largely upon postsecondary preparation. Even if our performance at the secondary level were better, the increasingly technical nature of jobs and the need that Mr. Odell referred to for a general upgrading of entry-level skills will in any event necessitate an emphasis on postsecondary preparation. I think this is the direction in which we must move, and that this conclusion is inescapable when you look at all the facts.

At the postsecondary level, we have 700,000 enrollments in publicly supported postsecondary vocational courses. I'm leaving out the 3,000,000 in adult courses, because I want to concentrate on this population of say, eighteen to twenty-four with which we really ought to be concerned here. There are also about 175,000 persons enrolled in apprenticeship programs. Private trade, technical and business schools, of which there are about 7,000 in this country, enroll something under 2,000,000. Undoubtedly private industry accounts for organized preparation--and I stress organized preparation, because I think that's what we're concerned about--of some thousands or tens of thousands more; I don't have the figure on that. But at the most, including everything, we're talking about 3,000,000 young people in some sort of postsecondary occupational education.

Now, of course, if we're talking about high-quality preparation for the job market of the 1970's and beyond, we would arrive at a far smaller figure than 3,000,000. My guess is maybe only 1,500,000. Now, match this training capacity against our sixteen- to twenty-four year old universe of 28,000,000 with 16,000,000 in the civilian labor force. The only thing I can suggest to you is that this is a perfectly appalling picture.

I personally have never been able to get out of my mind the terrible statistic of postsecondary technical-occupation enrollments which came out of the first National Advisory Council on Vocational-Technical education in 1968. At that time less than 3 percent of our

eighteen- to twenty-one year old population were enrolled in any form of subprofessional technical occupational education. We are in the midst of an ever-accelerating revolution in technology which is changing every aspect of our society, most particularly the job market, and we have a miniscule occupational training capacity in subprofessional technology. Again, I suggest to you that we're talking about a vital national interest; and this is a pretty frightening picture.

Let me say again candidly that I find this situation little understood by educators other than those who work in occupational fields. I find a great deal more understanding there, whether they're vocational educators at the secondary or at the post-secondary levels in junior college or community colleges, technical institutes, etc. This lack of understanding, if I have made an accurat assessment--and I honestly hope I haven't--is a very, very troubling situation.

Returning to the area where I have some professional competence, I do not find among members of Congress who work with education and manpower training and related matters any lack of understanding of these needs; quite the contrary. As a matter of fact, there is a growing concern among members of Congress who work in these fields legislatively that we are losing precious time in addressing these needs. That, I think, is the indispensable basis for some new legislative initiatives. And, of course, that's what I'm supposed to be talking about.

Let me say, while I'm talking about Congressional impatience, that there is some Congressional impatience with two attitudes widely encountered in education. One is that all we need to do is spend more money; the other attitude is that education is a large number of small, unrelated compartments, fiefdoms, and special interests, wherein the major concern is defending one's particular turf. Neither of these things will wash. The American people this year will spend over $65,000,000,000 on education. That's one-half of the total that will be spent in the world this year, and we have only 6 percent of the world's population. Just a parenthetical aside--if you think that population isn't a fair measure--we have less than one third of the world's developed resources. So our educational expenditures really are enormous. If we aren't doing the job in education with this outlay,

it must be because we're doing the wrong things. Among those wrong things, perhaps, are the way that we allocate our resources in education.

I didn't have this in my prepared remarks, because I was doing them hastily; but one of the best examples, or if you will, one of the worst examples of an allocation of resources is in the federal government itself. We spend $2,000,000,000 in all the agencies, including the Veterans Administration to support undergraduate and graduate students in higher education. We spend just a few millions of dollars for support of students in occupational education at all levels. That's just a fact. I'm not saying that we shouldn't invest in higher education in the way that we have. I'm saying simply that we ought to invest more in this other area which is of enormous importance, too. We just can't keep on shortchanging and downgrading 80 percent of the kids of this country and saying that only 20 percent have anything worthwhile to do in this world. Regrettably, that is part of the picture of our federal expenditures.

I have heard it said by vocational educators as a criticism of our manpower training program that we spend approximately $2,000,000,000 in manpower training and $500,000,000 at the outside to support vocational-technical education which, if adequately supported and adequately done, would eliminate a lot of the necessity for the manpower training. I don't agree with this contention, because we must spend that in manpower training, and perhaps more. The reason we have to do it is that the job isn't being done down the line in education, and people without jobs or with inadequate jobs need help right now. I think all of us realize this, and I think Malcolm Lovell and the people in the Labor Department with whom I work are perfectly well aware that we must be working toward an elimination of makeshift manpower training programs ten or twenty years from now. However, we have to be doing occupational education thoroughly before we get to that point.

I just want to say on this other point of dividing up education: that occupational education is a perfect example of why this is pure folly. If today we did use all of our available resources; if we used our area vocational schools, junior and community colleges, our private proprietary schools, and our four-year college branches, we still would not be meeting more than a fraction of the

need for occupational education. As vocational educators you know only too painfully well, that until so-called general education begins at every level to recognize that people learn in order to do the work of this world and that a knowledge of that work and how to prepare to do it is an essential part of any education, we are not going to make the progress that we can and must make in postsecondary or any other part of occupational education. Occupational education cannot begin only when students are well along in high school or have graduated from high school. And I think every one of you knows that you can not do much with functional illiterates, even those with a high school diploma.

We must talk more and more about taking a unified approach to occupational preparation, and that was one of the major directions pointed by the 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments. Last year's Administration proposal for postsecondary occupational education in the higher education bill was just not enough; and for those of you who are disturbed by it, I'll just say, it's dead. We need a totally new departure in this field.

In conclusion I want to make three points about the form and character legislatively of that departure. I think that legislatively we should not think in terms of amending the Vocational Education Act or amending higher education acts. We ought to think in terms of a separate act dealing with postsecondary occupational education. Second, I think our approach should not be institutional; it ought to be programmatic. We ought to be deciding what we must accomplish and then devise the mechanics of involving all of our available resources to accomplishing those objectives. I was very glad to hear Lowell Burkett make the point about being program-oriented. Third, I think that there is no inexpensive approach--I'm sure of this. Much of the cost might be reabsorbed in terms of reordering the priorities for using the educational dollar; but it still, I believe, will require a very heavy additional outlay at the federal level, state and local levels.

I deeply appreciate the opportunity to participate in this conference and in the very important work you are doing here. I expect to learn more from you than I can contribute to you.

Thank you.

CAREER EDUCATION

Marvin Feldman
Director of Program Development
Office of Economic Opportunity
United States Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

It's good to be with you again. It's been about a year, I think, since I have been with those of you in vocational and technical education. I hadn't realized how much I missed it until about four months ago when I was asked to take part in an interdepartmental task force looking at alternatives in education, and it all came back in a kind of a flood. The purpose of that exercise was to see what we could do with the career education act that's now bottled up with the higher education bill, Title VII, and to explore alternatives we have in dealing with it.

I feel very close to those of you in vocational and technical education, having spent over a dozen years in technical institute education. I mention this because if some of my comments seem harsh or presumptuous, I hope you can accept them in the spirit in which I offer them. They're the worried reflections of a sincere advocate of vocational-technical education.

Today I want to make my remarks from a point of view that is new to me. After a year at the Office of Economic Opportunity, many of my old biases were reinforced very dramatically. I know you're tired, if you reflect the majority of public opinion, of hearing about poverty, yet we have to mention it. The very tensions that grip the world today, everywhere, are born from a global struggle against poverty. We face it everywhere. In America poverty underlies the question of minority equality, the rebuilding of American cities, and the restoring of social health to Appalachia. In Europe, rapid urbanization promises severe problems to come. They've already begun in Germany this year. In Asia the poor are homeless, and the refugee problems soon to loom in Vietnam and other parts of Southeast Asia are going to put tremendous burdens on government. The problems of all developing nations everywhere, the Mideast, Africa, South America, are first of all problems of poverty. What makes this a special concern to those of us in vocational education is

that most of the dilemma that we face is chargeable directly to us. But our concern really falls in three parts--economic, social, and political.

From an economic point of view, poverty has been throughout history the environment needed to produce cheap labor, but in a post-industrial society, cheap labor is no longer needed. We no longer need unskilled labor to produce goods; machines produce goods. We need skilled labor to distribute and service goods. This is the whole business of the service economy that you heard from Mr. Odell. The emphasis on marketing goods makes poverty unsupportable from an economic point of view.

From a social point of view, poverty is a blight. It's a source of crime, of sickness, of social alienation; it's a spreading disease which infests communities. Poverty is ugly and it's drab, and it's ugly in all its forms. Where proverty exists it is pervasive; it controls its environment completely, saps energies, and devours funds that should go into other causes. It burdens communities with expensive services for treatment; it builds police forces instead of schools and it highlights divisions, polarizations, and tensions. Poverty strips people of their belongings and makes insecurity a way of life. From a social point of view, if government is to serve the whole community, poverty cannot be tolerated.

From a political point of view, poverty is a liability. The young who cannot qualify for decent jobs distrust the society which reared them. Dissidents speak with voices of rebellion. Campus and inner city revolt reaches into our public secondary schools. The poor become numerous and organized and articulate enough to reject external leadership and controls and seek their own. The inevitable result is polarization and strife. Poverty makes it possible for radical groups, teamed with political opportunists, to alter materially our traditional economic, political and social concepts. The only political cure is to eradicate or at least ameliorate poverty, to develop new political methods based on alliance rather than control. So of all the fundamental reasons for attacking poverty, the political ones are the most pressing. Everywhere in the world today, poverty no longer connotes docility; poverty means instability.

In searching for ways to overcome poverty, we have our choice of many remedies. In fact, economically as well as politically, the world is under tension as a result of diametrically opposed views and concepts of government's role in alleviating poverty. But we here in America--at least up until now--have rejected the wholly materialistic philosophy which regards the individual as a sort of soulless unit governed by a complete and powerful state.

In searching for better ways to overcome poverty, education seemed to us to offer a greater promise. Education is in a sense the logical way, we thought, to attack poverty because it provides a clear path to escape from poverty. We attacked poverty through education, really, because we must. Education is the foundation, we said. With it better housing will come, better programs of opportunity, training, and so on; without education, none of these things will happen.

The paradox is really distressingly clear. What we've learned in the last half a dozen to a dozen years is that poverty does not respond to conventional education. It never has; it never will. Poverty has receded, or it's been held to a low level only when education has been offered with a vocational purpose, without the customary formalities and requirements. Poverty will not be reduced by opening up new universities and creating new programs in university education. The problem of providing education that will reduce poverty begins long before that system of higher education begins. It's a problem of building habits, outlooks and opportunities that our schools, particularly higher education, seem to take for granted.

As Mr. Radcliffe just mentioned before, probably our most serious misuse of major resources is in education. Eighty percent of the labor force work at jobs that do not require a college degree; but the federal government spends fourteen dollars on higher education for every dollar it invests in vocational and career education. More than that, our educational system is geared to serve a college-bound minority. Thus, it neglects the real need of most of the students, and the consequences are alarming. Most of our young people are being prepared for a world they will never see. Their education is irrelevant to the demands and opportunities of the work world. This is tragic. It is thoughtless discrimination against those who will serve society as technicians and as craftsmen.

It means that millions of our young people are struggling to prepare for mistaken goals. It is an absolute outrage.

The burden of our failure to provide relevant education falls heaviest on those least able to bear it. Education is the weapon most certain to succeed in the War Against Poverty, but we've used it clumsily and carelessly. Poverty persists primarily because we have failed to build sound educational paths and logical career paths out of poverty. We've asked the children of poverty to follow expensive paths that lead nowhere. We've squandered our resources, and, worst of all, we have crushed the fragile optimism of millions of our disadvantaged young people.

We have said that any child has a right to an education, and in that we've succeeded. We have provided an education of sorts to every child, but the time has come to go much farther. The time has come to say that every child has a right to a relevant education, an education fitted to his needs and abilities and aspirations, an education designed to discover and nourish his unique potential. But most important, an education that is a pathway to an appropriate and satisfying vocation.

To make education relevant will require a radical reorienting of educational priorities, particularly as it relates to those institutions represented here called postsecondary institutions that I'm going to blast in about a minute. We need, first of all, to enlarge our effort in vocational education. Just now we're spending about four dollars in the Labor Department on remedial and manpower programs, because we have to, for every dollar that we spend on preventive vocational programs, because we've had no demonstration by vocational education that it has a mission in preventive education.

We're spending far more to reduce the pool of the unemployed than we are in reducing the tragic daily flow of the people into that pool. Apparently, our educational system is no longer a long path to a satisfying vocation for everyone. Right now in this country we spend about $1,400,000,000 dollars for vocational education. Of this, 18 percent is federal, and the rest of it is state and local. I won't go into the statistics of how many are enrolled and what they're doing and all this sort of thing. Setting that aside and saying, that's all right, the problem is that it doesn't reach enough people; there

are not enough people enrolled in the program. There's a huge potential market that still hasn't been reached. Let me enumerate quickly some segments of this potential market.

There are elementary school students. Robert Worthington, State Director of Vocational Education in New Jersey, has set up a program called Technology for Children in about 114 classrooms, and he's proving to New Jersey's satisfaction, at any rate to the State Legislature's satisfaction, that vocational experiences can help children learn more science, social studies, math and reading and so on, by designing episodes that would be helpful in elementary education. Dr. Worthington turned to postsecondary institutions for help for many episodes, but he didn't find any. He had to import his own staff into the state department to do anything, and to this day he's receiving very little support from the postsecondary institutions that should be helping him design these kinds of episodes.

There are secondary and postsecondary students who want vocational education and can't be admitted because of inadequate facilities. I now live in Washington, D. C. They've turned away 500 students from Washington's secondary vocational schools, and about 100 students were turned away from Washington's Technical Institute, just this year. Across the nation there are hundreds and hundreds of kids who aren't getting access to vocational education.

There are young people who are headed for work after graduation from high school who now receive no training at all, about 7,500,000 people this year. Then there are high school and college dropouts, 750,000 annually, who leave high school, virtually all without marketable skills. Young people who would like to, and ought to, test the work world in some educational program in a field that they think they want to spend their working lives in, before they commit themselves to postsecondary institutions. We haven't even scratched the surface of that group.

Another segment of the potential market is comprised of high school and college students who need income to permit them just to continue their education or who need cooperative jobs to complete their vocational or academic training. The '68 amendments, for example, gave strong

support to this, but it was so inadequately funded it hasn't even scratched the surface.

Then there are unemployed or soon-to-be unemployed workers, not expecting callback, forced by shifts in technology, obsolete skills, or shifts in demand, to learn a marketable skill. We discovered quickly what happened in Seattle, Washington last year, how inadequate we were in preparing people who needed retraining and needed reconnection to the work world. Fully-employed workers facing unemployment, or highly motivated working poor stuck in low-skill, low-pay jobs, often moonlighting to stretch their income to cover their families' needs, all need to acquire a skill which will break them out of poverty or prevent them from becoming poverty stricken.

The irony of poverty is that it doesn't have a damn thing to do with a job. Most of the poor people are working; the mothers and the fathers of poor families work. But they work at lousy jobs, at low-paying jobs, where there aren't any hopes for advancement or career escalation. Such was the agony we faced recently in trying to move our Family Assistance Planning program. There are others. There are decently paid workers stuck in tedious, dead-end jobs who are frustrated by those jobs and need different skills to improve their job satisfaction. We haven't even begun to tap into that particular part of the market.

There are mothers of school-age children who need and want to re-enter the labor market but need skill training to raise them above the low-paid service occupations traditionally reserved for the unskilled, or they may simply need refresher training to update their skills. I just think of the thousands and thousands of women wanting to re-enter the work world when their children begin to approach college age, who need an income, and have no access to the kinds of training programs that would allow them to make this kind of a connection.

Older workers, voluntarily or involuntarily retired, who want to continue work but need a new marketable skill or updating of a previous skill constitute another group needing retraining.

Mental hospital patients, during their stay and upon discharge, often need a marketable skill to sustain themselves economically. There were 308,000 live releases from mental hospitals last year, and I wonder how well we've served that particular group.

We haven't talked about the veterans returning from Vietnam to civilian life. Many of them entered the service too young to have acquired any work skill. They will need training upon discharge.

A final group is comprised of prisoners needing pre- and post-release skill training and related work experience. At present there are about 195,000 people in prisons. We can expect about a 75 percent recidivism rate upon their release, because we haven't adequately developed educational programs which will allow them to cope with the life styles that the world demands. We haven't even tapped into that market yet.

These target groups which encompass a substantial portion of our entire population only touch upon the supply side. If I had time I'd give you 30 minutes of demand side, in terms of skills that are needed which are not anywhere near meeting, in ecology and in police and fire science, but you people are in the business. You know the list.

Turning to issues now, my main concern for about twenty years has been in finding a way to end confusing vocational education with practical training for a job. I suppose like others before me, I've really failed. To assume that vocational education is identical in content and process with vocational training programs in industry is to deny the all-important spirit in which it's being studied in educational institutions. Are you running institutions merely to meet job requirements or are they being used to liberate and enlarge the human spirit? That, it seems to me, is a vital question that has been the focus of debate and often heated controversy for too many years. It appears in various forms and guises every time vocational or technical or career education is up for policy review; I just relived it again during these past two weeks.

The argument is schools versus private industry for training, specific versus general education, secondary versus postsecondary education, comprehensive versus

special purpose education, the list is endless. Strangely, this question facing you in your present educational turmoil has not found an answer acceptable to educational policy-makers, because you have not answered it yourselves as practitioners in the field. You appear to be in great confusion over this absolutely central point: Do you want your schools to be places where young people become vocationally literate, or do you want them to be job training centers? This question of priority is paramount. It's not just the question of finances, since it's at the very heart of a central issue concerning the role of the private sector in career development. If that question isn't answered very soon by you, it's going to be answered for you.

The fact is that interest in secondary vocational education by those of you who manage postsecondary programs has not really been heard, particularly as to the place and purpose of secondary vocational education in the educational system. This has served to distort its problems and multiply all the agonies of career education versus the job training syndrome.

Instead of an organized, articulate voice in a major offense against wasteful educational policies, our field has been preoccupied with minor internal bickering about technical institutes versus vocational education, and vocational agriculture and homemaking against new careers. Let me cite an example. A number of recent studies were submitted to a policy review panel about a week ago about the cost-benefits of vocational education. The conclusion in regard to students employed in jobs for which they were trained were negative. There are three points I want to make regarding the implications of this kind of Mickey Mouse study. They haven't been made, and somebody ought to make them. First, vocational education should not be judged solely by the record of its graduates in obtaining and holding jobs for which they have been trained. No other branch of education is judged by this standard. All branches of education, damn it, are vocational. The unemployment of a vocationally trained machinist, which is a function of the labor market, of employment policies of a host of pressures having nothing to do with education, is characterized as a failure of the vocational system, whereas the unemployment of the liberal arts graduate is lost in statistics, if noted at all. There is ample reason to

believe that vocational education contributes to the individual's ability to get and hold a job, even if that job does not require some or all of the specific skills that he's been taught. He'll have an understanding of the work world; he'll have a knowledge of tools and equipment and materials and processes; he'll have some transferable skills as well as the broad skills. The point is that vocational education is education. People in higher education have never recognized that fundamental point. You people who manage postsecondary institutions, community colleges and technical institutes could make connections that have never been developed before in this nation, between postsecondary and higher education, and between postsecondary and secondary vocational education, which is probably your greatest constituency in the United States. Vocational education turns out its rounded men, too. The curves may be a little sharp in places, but they are rounded too.

Second, is my concern about the apparent, well-meaning efforts of our private-sector job training. I hear over and over and over again, particularly in the past week, that job skills are acquired on the job, and that such training is more effective and more efficient than vocational education. The fact is, however, that both methods are used often in combination with each other. A definite trend indicates increasing importance of institutional connections with job training and a blending of these kinds of programs. On-the-job training, first of all, is costly. The programs are expensive, and companies have no guarantees that employees stay with them once they've been trained. You ask company officers at Bell Telephone what they learned as we did last week: A fantastic cost with a turnover of about 50 percent of the people that they train. The larger companies tend to have formal training programs; smaller companies don't because they can't afford them. Even the larger companies make no attempt to train all of their skilled workers in all the skills they need because they couldn't. The cost would be prohibitive. The small number of apprentices is attributable not only to severe union restraint, but also to the fact that the increasing costs are prohibitive to the industries themselves. More important, on-the-job training presupposes some education. Literacy alone may be all that is needed in the way of specific preparatory knowledge. We say that employability very often has little to do with the manipulative

skills, little to do with what people call vocational-technical education, but here we overlook the fact that technical-vocational education is the very process that produced the ability to communicate.

My third and final point with which I want to sum up deals with the issue of postsecondary versus secondary vocational and technical education. There is one point of view in the land that we should move all the vocational education into postsecondary institutions. Another point of view is that postsecondary institutions utilize wasteful practices and the vocational education they offer could just as well be done in the secondary schools. I don't think it's necessary to even take a stand on the question of whether it's necessary to move postsecondary vocational-technical education into secondary institutions. Where the trend is there, it's going to happen. Where it isn't, it won't. There are poor people who, even if they had access to your postsecondary institutions, even if the education were free, and even if you dealt with their student characteristics, still couldn't afford to wait for access to postsecondary programs. So that's not the issue. I think the issue is that institutions of postsecondary occupational and technical education have got to reorder their own understanding of who they are, where they belong, and who they connect with. The question facing us right now is should we break out postsecondary career education, as we tried a year ago, and under higher education create some career education alternatives and options, or should we take a look at career education as being a continuum of secondary-postsecondary, adult returning education, and create a piece of legislation that's based on a kind of a merger, or a connection, or--if you'll forgive the jargon--articulation with secondary-postsecondary education.

My question to you is: Who do you belong to? Who do you want to identify with? And this really hasn't been heard. What frightens me is this, in Moynihan's terms, it's about five minutes to midnight. We've been tinkering around and tinkering around, with people worrying about turf, and people worrying about prestige, and people worrying about delivery systems at the state level, without any real look at the kinds of people that we want to serve and the needs of those fourteen subgroups that I mentioned earlier.

I just hope that during your deliberations later this afternoon you'll want to face some of those issues and see if there is any way at all to get some organized voice speaking for career occupational education.

Thank you.

THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION AND ITS COMMITMENT TO EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION

Joseph T. Nerden
Professor of Industrial and Technical Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

From the first three panelists you've had some very strong philosophical statements and certainly some evidence concerning the economic problems and social problems attendant upon the provision of good vocational education. You have heard strong statements about who should be served in this United States, how they should be served, who ought to do the serving, when they should be served, and so forth. You have also heard about how much it will cost, or how much it ought to cost, to do the job right. These are three strong statements, so I comment that, by contrast at this point, all you're going to hear from me is a report on what is being done by the American Vocational Association to take into account some of the concerns of these three gentlemen and some plans for the immediate future.

With over 1,000 two-year institutions in operation in the nation, and with some expectation that that number will double within the next ten years, it is clear that provisions for adequate representation of these institutions within the structure of occupational education must be made. The American Vocational Association has been cognizant of this need and has been working with individuals, organizations and committees drawn from the two-year institutions, in order to recognize and facilitate the interests and concerns of those who provide occupational preparation in these institutions. Two of these concerns that have received much attention by the American Vocational Association are evaluation and its extension into accreditation. In a sense evaluation is accountability, and the legal roots of this activity may be found in both the 1963 Vocational Act and its subsequent 1968 Amendments. Evaluation appears in several sections of the 1968 Act, and while evaluation has long been a concern of the American Vocational Association, the activity has taken on additional importance with a variety of implications of the Federal legislation.

Through the years, vocational people have placed <u>much</u> emphasis upon devices which measure the quantity and quality

of occupational education programs, but time, personnel available for the task, and dollars have made it impossible for vocational enterprises throughout the nation to engage in evaluation and accreditation activities to the extent deemed necessary. However, about a decade ago, the board of directors of the American Vocational Association recognized the urgency of producing (annually) hard data concerning the successes and limitations of occupational programs conducted throughout the nation and, as a first step, created a committee for the evaluation and accreditation of vocational education programs. This committee has been actively involved in these matters during the entire decade, and it is about some of its activities that I wish to speak briefly this afternoon.

At first, the emphasis by the American Vocational Association was on evaluation on an "in-house" procedure for maintaining and further improving all vocational education programs. Soon it became apparent that the growing need for accreditation in Federally reimbursed programs would force the American Vocational Association (and other agencies) into consideration of evaluation as a primary step toward accreditation. There were other elements, too, that made it necessary to couple evaluation and accreditation into a single committee activity, and these influences included not only Federal funding possibilities, but also the pressures being placed upon vocational education by faculty, students, employers of graduates, and many others. The stamp of approval, which is in fact accreditation, was regarded by each of these groups as a highly desirable characteristic of a program and, hence, a necessity for the future.

AVA Activities in Accreditation Are Five in Number

Activity 1. The American Vocational Association has been the focal point for meetings, conferences, and numerous other discussion sessions, all directed toward working with the recognized accrediting agencies in the nation in the matter of evaluating and ultimately accrediting all kinds and types of vocational education programs. Meetings and discussions with the six regional accrediting associations in the nation, with the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA) and with many of the private agencies responsible for accreditation reach back over ten years.

It has always been the hope of the AVA Committee on Evaluation and Accreditation that discussions held during the years would result in careful consideration of the occupational education parts of the program offered in area schools, in high schools and in the two-year, postsecondary institutions. Recognizing that the National Commission on Accrediting was the important rallying point in all discussions concerned with accreditation, the committee worked originally with Dr. William Selden, then later with Dr. Frank Dickey and his associate, Mr. Jerry Miller, in these matters. During the years, AVA established a most useful and harmonious working relationship with NCA, resulting in a continued involvement in establishing workable relationships between those in the occupational education field and the six regional accrediting associations.

Activity 2. With the extension of occupational education, both laterally and vertically, the National Commission on Accrediting two years ago established the Interim Council on Accreditation of postsecondary occupational education programs. As its chairman, I was privileged to work with about 20 other nationally selected persons directly concerned with accreditation on the postsecondary level. The Interim Council fulfilled a real need during its two-year period, and it is anticipated that it will soon be converted into a permanent council, representative of both the public and private sectors of occupational education in the country. There is some expection, also, that the National Commission on Accrediting will very shortly engage in a national study and research relative to accreditation of occupational education programs in postsecondary institutions, and that the American Vocational Association will continue to have a cooperative role to play in this proposed national study.

Activity 3. Convinced of its several responsibilities in the matters of evaluation and accreditation, a year and a half ago the American Vocational Association submitted to the U. S. Office of Education a proposal for a grant to study accreditation of occupational education, to develop standards and criteria for its evaluation and ultimate accreditation, and to field test the standards and criteria prior to their recommendation to the six regional accrediting associations for possible adoption and use. Dr. George Brandon of the AVA Washington office and Mr. Jerry Miller of the NCA were the co-authors of the proposal for the grant which won approval from the USOE. Working cooperatively with the NCA, AVA succeeded in obtaining

approximately $167,000 for the initial steps to be taken in its nation-wide activity of evaluation and accreditation. A year has passed, and the standards and criteria assembled by the AVA staff, headed by Mr. Lane Ash, are about ready for field testing. It is a very hopeful and promising project, and the beneficial results of this activity should be evident to the profession shortly.

Activity 4. Another activity which will have considerable effect upon evaluation and, possibly, ultimate accreditation of occupational education programs at all levels in the nation is the soon-to-appear publication entitled The Vocational Instructor and Self-Evaluation. During the summer of 1970, it became clearly apparent, by virtue of the AVA executive secretary's (Lowell Burkett) participation in the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, that increasing attention at the local level would need to be given to evaluation of vocational education. Assembled for consideration of this matter was a small committee of eight that met in AVA headquarters and made some decisions concerning the production of a useful guide that might be prepared for instructors in vocational education programs and used as a device for self-evaluation. The committee prepared a rough draft outlining in ten sections the suggested standards and criteria for self-evaluation which should be considered by each of the 50,000 members of AVA. In early fall, the standards and criteria were assembled in draft form and distributed for field testing to the 50 states. The results of the field testing are now being reviewed in the AVA headquarters, and very shortly the document should be ready for final editing and printing through the facilities of the AVA committee on publications. The AVA believes that by reaching into the consciousness of every instructor, supervisor and administrator of vocational education, the standards and criteria will provoke further consideration, further improvement and accountability for the quantity and quality of vocational programs.

Activity 5. The American Vocational Association participates actively in several other important activities which bear directly upon evaluation and accreditation. Its national executive secretary, Mr. Lowell Burkett, is a member of the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, and is chairman of the special subcommittee dealing with evaluation of occupational education programs. Also, the AVA is represented on several important committees of the USOE dealing with evaluation and accreditation

as they affect vocational education enterprises in both public and private sectors.

Problems Which We Face in Accreditation and Evaluation

I would like to point out three of the many problems which we of AVA face in connection with matters of evaluation and accreditation.

Problem 1. The first problem is one which has received considerable discussion throughout the nation--institutional accreditation versus program or curriculum accreditation. This particular problem area comes close to the heart of quality vocational education wherever it is conducted, since many of the professionals in the field believe that the maintenance and further improvement of occupational education programs can only come about through the improvement of each of the respective curricula within a school program. On the other hand, the regional accrediting associations, with whom the AVA has been working cooperatively during the past decade, have established procedures for institutional accreditation. The regionals have set a pattern, and an accommodation will have to be sought for the regional "institutional accreditation" versus the strongly supported "curriculum accreditation" advocated by vocational people. Back of all of this is the pride with which highly specialized teachers, craftsmen, and technician-instructors exhibit in connection with their respective curriculums and their wish to be recognized for the quality and quantity of their respective curricula. Still further, some elements of the occupational education programs blend themselves more readily into institutional accreditation than into curriculum accreditation. For example, the rapid growth of the middle-grades occupational education programs in the nation clearly involves all elements of the school program, and the programs lend themselves readily to institutional accreditation. On the other end of the spectrum are the nearly 200 institutions in the nation which conduct occupational education programs from grades 9 or 10 through 14, for whom the values of institutional accreditation are difficult to comprehend. With curricula operating on secondary and postsecondary levels, with some curricula being conducted as preparation for higher education and with still others being of either the short-term or long-term variety, the matter of institutional accreditation is not looked upon

as the recommended procedure for providing discrete information with regard to any one specific curriculum. Many vocational people question the procedure and, as indicated earlier, recognize that an accommodation will have to be sought with the established institutional accreditation procedures utilized by the regional accrediting associations.

Problem 2. Real problems develop when vocational people attempt to force occupational education programs into the established academic matrix. Most vocational people view their contributions to the total education of individuals as being discrete, distinct, and certainly not something which gives up its identity as it is coaxed into blending with the oft-described "mainstream of all education." In a word, vocational educators are convinced that vocational education is different, and it will continue to require different procedures to provide occupational preparation for all who are capable of receiving it and who need it. As a rationale for this last, it has been pointed out that in four distinct characteristics, vocational education is different from most other kinds of education. An examination of these four characteristics would appear to indicate that there is ample evidence that vocational education (as a discipline) is not now, nor will it be in the foreseeable future, similar to traditional academic education. In the first place, the individuals served by vocational education are generally youth and adults drawn from the lowest socio-economic stratum; when compared to students in academic programs whose intent generally is to go on to higher education, it may be clearly seen that the motivations and the social and economic backgrounds of the people served by vocational education differ greatly from those going the four-year college route. With regard to the second characteristic, the curricula that are served to the youth and adults in vocational education are quite different from those served to college-oriented students. The curricula are job-oriented, with emphasis upon skills, technical knowledge and communication skills. Even the mathematics, science, and other technical subjects of the program are applied (related) to the major vocational thrust. With regard to the third characteristic, instructors for vocational programs, it is quite apparent that most of these individuals are neither prepared nor come through the usual route which produces instructors of academic subjects. Rather, individuals who have the responsibility of teaching within vocational programs are themselves work-oriented and bring with them a required background

of wage-earning work experience. Many of those who teach in the vocational program have only a high school diploma coupled with a decade or more of high quality work experience. In this very important characteristic alone, vocational instructors are quite different from their academic counterparts. Even in the design of the facilities and the selection of the equipment used in vocational education (the fourth characteristic), similarities to academic education are lacking. Vocational education is generally conducted in job-oriented types of surroundings, and, in the case of cooperative vocational education, activities actually take place out in the businesses, hospitals, industries and factories of the region. Shops that look like shops and laboratories that look much like commercial laboratories are the intent of the designers of vocational facilities. When compared with the usual academic education, the motivation inherent in job-oriented facilities makes its impact upon students, faculty, employers of graduates, and the community at large.

There are several other characteristics of vocational education which differentiate it from college-oriented education; there are very few which would indicate that it could be considered along with its academic counterpart as making up the "mainstream of all education." With different people to be served, with totally different curricula to be served to them, with instructors whose qualifications for job-oriented types of instruction differ considerably from their academic counterparts, and with facilities which resemble the world of work, there is every reason to believe that the planning, organization, administration and measurement of successes and limitations in vocational education demand different treatment than that normally accorded academic education. Vocational people ask rhetorically, "Is vocational education really different?" It would appear so! Further complications in this matter of people to be served may be noted in the short-term occupational education curricula that are offered throughout the nation. Manpower Development Training Programs are vocational education programs and must be considered within the realm of occupational evaluation. How, then, shall these kinds of short-term curricula be jammed into the matrix of academic education evaluation and accreditation and still have the total process mean anything? King-size problems are there, too!

Problem 3. Vocational people are not only concerned with standards and criteria and whether or not institutional, curriculum or program accreditation is the issue; they are also concerned with the procedures that will be used by the evaluating and accrediting personnel. They are concerned with the selection of the individuals on the committees that will visit and apply standards and criteria and with the procedures which these committees will use. Vocational people are concerned with the evaluating committee members, particularly when the guidelines and criteria are placed in the hands of regional accreditation associations and others. They ask such questions as: Will the members of the visiting committees know what it is they are supposed to be looking for? Will they have occupational backgrounds which will enable them to intelligently apply the standards and criteria under widely varying circumstances? Will vocational people have a role to play on vocational evaluation and accreditation committees? Such questions have been raised during the past ten years during AVA meetings, and they indicate that this could be a matter of serious concern.

Finally, it has been my pleasure to point out to you the sincere involvement of the AVA in all matters affecting the evaluation and accreditation of occupational education. May I now inject a few of my own personal comments with regard to the suggested roles to be played in the immediate future by the more than 1,500 two-year institutions in the nation. Most of these institutions have a very real stake in occupational education and, certainly, in its continuous and continual evaluation and subsequent accreditation. By virtue of the activity in which the American Vocational Association has taken such a lead during the past decade, you are earnestly invited to join hands with us of AVA and assist in processing matters of evaluation and accreditation through to the stage of successful operation. AVA has much of the required expertise and has established an office and staff headed by Mr. Lane Ash, in order to focus all points of interest and concern in the nation on the problems of occupational evaluation and accreditation. AVA has demonstrated its concern and has invested heavily its own funds in this activity, in the interest of its 50,000 members throughout the nation. AVA has a sizeable USOE grant for the development of standards and criteria for accreditation, and usable results should soon be available. Overall, AVA has a commitment to its 50,000 members to see the activity

of evaluation and accreditation through to a successful and workable conclusion, and it needs all the advice, all the counsel, and all the help it can get from all of the institutions in the nation who today (and who will tomorrow) conduct occupational education programs. Come join with us!

GROUP DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To provide an opportunity for those attending the conference to make maximum input, conference participants were divided into five discussion groups. Participants were randomly assigned to each group, and those who made presentations to the general meeting rotated among the discussion groups. No attempt was made to structure or direct the discussions except that they were confined to problems concerning or impinging upon postsecondary occupational education.

The major concerns, priorities, and recommendations for action emanating from the various discussion groups are enumerated below.

Discussion Group A

Group Chairman: Jer[illegible] Shostak
Sen[illegible]ublic Relations Specialist
[illegible]rn Electric Fund
New York, New York

Group Recorder: Addison S. Hobbs
Director of Vocational Technical Education Programs
Washington Technical Institute
Washington, D. C.

Issues and Problems

-- Lack of continuity and insufficiency of funding cause difficulty in the operation of programs of postsecondary occupational education. This is particularly true of programs funded from more than one source or dependent upon multifunding procedures.

-- To provide alternatives for job entry and upgrading or retraining, the possibilities of job clustering merit further investigation and consideration.

-- The relationship between short-term and long-term occupational programs could be more clearly defined by establishing levels of competencies which may or may not be viewed as continuous by the worker at various maturity stages which are implicit in the definition of career education.

-- Potential recipients of postsecondary vocational-technical education have different levels of need, maturity and aspirations than do persons who pursue vocational education at the secondary level. If postsecondary technical-vocational education is to diversify and expand to serve more of the population than in the past, these differences must be recognized, and new methods of presenting the various programs must be designed.

-- The voucher or contract system of providing grants directly to students can be successful only where the objectives of such systems are specifically stipulated and the potential recipients clearly identified.

-- There is a pressing need for greater articulation between the various levels of vocational-technical education at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels.

-- More effective utilization of advisory committees in technical-vocational education is needed to improve communications with and among the various constituencies served.

Priorities for Action

-- Steps should be taken to ensure that funds for occupational education are allocated to various systems and types of institutions based upon their performance as measured by objective criteria.

-- Efforts should be undertaken to diversify program offerings for potential recipients of occupational education, and a method should be devised whereby each program can be evaluated in terms of minimum standards which, when met, will assure funding.

-- More effective articulation of various levels of vocational-technical education is essential to minimize unnecessary duplication of effort and to provide for orderly transition from one level to another.

-- To provide occupational education for a greater number of recipients and to provide more employment options for the graduate, adaptation of a job cluster approach in curriculum development should be undertaken.

Recommendation

Directed to AVA and AAJC:

The American Vocational Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges should make every effort to combine forces for a strong front to express the universe of need for postsecondary occupational education and to press for legislation which will provide sufficient funds to accomplish the educational task.

Discussion Group B

Group Chairman: Arden L. Pratt
Director of New Institutions Project
American Association of Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C.

Group Recorder: Oran H. Beaty
Area Director of Vocational-Technical Education
Council Bluffs, Iowa

Issues and Problems

-- Congress and governmental agencies appear to feel that the public schools have failed to provide a relevant type of education for many youth and adults, resulting in re-channeling of funds to other agencies.

-- Secondary and postsecondary school administrators and vocational personnel seem to lack the dynamic

leadership needed to develop a system of vocational-technical education for the youth and adults of today which is commensurate with the needs of our society.

-- Colleges and universities are turning out administrators, teachers, and counselors who lack an understanding of the educational needs of youth and adults in today's technical environment.

-- The U. S. Department of Labor has devoted too much effort to attempting to provide education and training and not enough effort to raising the image of the worker and the job in the work-a-day world.

-- There is too little articulation between institutions providing academic and vocational education, resulting in the inability of students to transfer from one to the other and to receive credit for prior education.

-- Both government agencies and educational institutions have failed to develop the long-range plans essential to the orderly growth and development of occupational education.

-- A lack of communication between accrediting agencies and schools offering occupational education has resulted in the use of irrelevant and inadequate standards and criteria for the evaluation of occupational education.

-- Inadequate support for vocational programs is attributable to a lack of communication between schools, the public, business and industry groups, and legislative bodies.

Priorities for Action

-- An effective line of two-way communication must be developed between users and potential users of occupational education, employers and potential employers of the products of occupational education, the lay public, leaders in all phases of education, federal agencies, and Congress.

-- Efforts must be made to select school leadership that has a broader concept of the educational needs of the individual who does not fit into the presently used educational scheme which emphasizes academic education for all.

-- We should promote a belief in a total educational plan commensurate with the needs of society and all individuals, not just a plan for students who like or readily adjust to the present system.

-- The "who" and "how" of delivery systems for education have no innate importance. The prime objective should be the provision of valid occupational education opportunities for all who can benefit from them using whatever delivery system is available or devisable.

Recommendations

Directed to AVA and AAJC:

-- Undertake a broad-scale program to promote recognition of the importance of and benefits to be derived from vocational-technical education as a means of obtaining greater student acceptance.

Directed to U. S. Department of Labor:

-- Direct an all-out campaign for recognition and glamorization of the skilled and technical workers equivalent to that engaged in by the armed services, in order to attract persons to enter training.

Discussion Group C

Group Chairman: William Bruce Howell
Executive Secretary, Florida State Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Group Recorder: Lloyd J. Phipps
Department of Vocational Technical Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Issues and Problems

-- The funding structure for occupational education does not adequately earmark funds for postsecondary education.

-- There is a confusion in terminology being utilized in the various areas impinging on occupational education. This confusion results from differing interpretations of common terms.

-- In many states postsecondary education is not adequately involved in the development of state plans for vocational-technical education.

-- It is possible that the manpower councils and the advisory councils established under the 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments are duplicative or contradictory in direction and should be integrated into a single council.

-- More effective methods for communicating desired changes in postsecondary education to the decision makers at the national level are needed.

-- For the mutual benefit of all, ways must be devised to better articulate secondary and postsecondary education.

-- There is lack of agreement as to whether accreditation emphasis should be placed on institutional or programmatic accreditation.

Priorities

-- A funding structure which earmarks funds for postsecondary occupational education should be established.

-- A glossary of terms for occupational education should be developed.

-- Postsecondary occupational education should be more involved in the development of state plans for occupational education.

-- A procedure should be established for bringing desired changes in occupational education to the attention of the policy makers at the national level.

-- Greater articulation between the various levels of occupational education and a unification of efforts in behalf of occupational education is essential to maximize accomplishments.

-- Present accreditation practices should be evaluated to determine whether institutional accreditation provides the assurance of quality within programs and curricula or whether programmatic accreditation is needed.

Recommendations

Directed to AVA:

-- AVA should take the lead in establishing a funding system that earmarks funds for the various levels of occupational education.

-- AVA should evaluate present occupational accreditation practices and establish guidelines to be used in the future to ensure equitable program development and evaluation.

Discussion Group D

Group Chairman: Robert L. McKee
Project Director of AMIDS
Washington Technical Institute
Washington, D. C.

Group Recorder: Donald Farrens, Dean
Vocational-Technical Education Division
South Florida Junior College
Avon Park, Florida

Issues and Problems

-- Fragmentation of programs and efforts exists at all levels of occupational education. Much of this fragmentation arises from federal legislation, but is compounded because each state operates in a different manner.

-- Accreditation as a prerequisite to meeting federal funding requirements has resulted in occupational education being measured by unrealistic and inapplicable standards and criteria. Accreditation is too heavily process-oriented and needs to place more emphasis upon standards and criteria which measure the product of the educational process.

-- Academic orientation of educators in general presents a problem for occupational education. There is a need to orient college presidents, deans, faculty, state department personnel, etc. to the concepts, problems, needs, and philosophy of vocational-technical education.

-- Vocational-technical education must be adequately prepared to train and retrain people who are underemployed or become unemployed due to advanced technology which makes their skills obsolete.

-- A proliferation of funding agencies in the federal government has led to unnecessary duplication of efforts, the lack of a unified effort in vocational-technical education, and dependence at the state and local level upon organizations which lack the expertise to provide an effective program of vocational-technical education. As a result, limited resources have not been used to maximum advantage.

-- There is a great need for pre-vocational orientation programs that will introduce the student to vocational education at an early age and give him an established set of positive values with which to approach decision-making concerning career opportunities. Occupational and preoccupational courses should begin no later than the middle school or junior high years so that higher

competencies in specialist areas may be taught later in the secondary system.

-- Lack of adequate and accurate statistical data upon which job needs and manpower projects can be based has caused weaknesses in short-term and long-range planning in technical and vocational education.

-- Improved methods are needed in counseling, training, and working with the disadvantaged in order to identify how they can better be brought into programs of occupational training and education and how they can be retained until successful completion of the program.

Priorities

-- Accreditation, its implications for funding, and the validity of its process, procedures, and criteria for occupational education merit much further study.

-- Pre-vocational programs and orientation for the elementary and middle school-age children are essential to the long-term success of occupational education.

-- Provisions for more effective implementation of the new manpower program now in Congress are sorely needed.

Recommendations

Directed to AVA Staff and National Advisory Council:

-- A national ad hoc committee should be appointed to study the problems of accreditation and its ramifications in securing federal sanctions and funds. This group suggests that more emphasis be placed on product standards rather than on process standards. Adoption of uniform standards and evaluative criteria would improve the effectiveness of accreditation and help bring about programs which would better meet the needs of employers, employees, and unions and

would stimulate these organizations to establish more flexible working relations and hence superior conditions for the student in both his training and employability.

Directed to AVA, Educational Organizations, and Members of Congress:

-- The members of this group suggest that provisions be written into the new manpower legislation to provide for pre-vocational training and orientation for all elementary and junior high school children. This is essential if the philosophy of "academic education for all" is to be overcome. Plans should also be implemented to provide and necessitate training for all teachers, counselors, and administrators concerning the role of modern-day occupational education and the need for full understanding, cooperation, and support if it is to fully meet the needs of the nation.

Directed to National Advisory Council:

-- Because the manpower training programs and vocational education are so fragmented into the many agencies of the federal government, we feel that strong consideration should be given to the appointment of a cabinet post for a Commissioner of Education. It is felt that this person could give better overall direction to the many problems faced by occupational education and could better administer the total program through the nation's schools and colleges.

Discussion of Group E

Group Chairman: Robert Knoebel, Director
Bureau of Management Services
Department of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Group Recorder: Walter J. Bartz, Coordinator
Postsecondary Coordination Unit
Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Springfield, Illinois

Issues and Problems

-- There is a failure on the part of vocational educators to organize their resources to meet adequately the manpower training requirements of the nation.

-- There is some lack of understanding of funding procedures within the proposed Comprehensive Community College Act (Williams' Bill).

-- There is an unresolved question as to whether Congress' basic approach to postsecondary occupational education should be institutional or programmatic.

-- The extent to which AVA should and does become involved in the direction of and services to postsecondary occupational education programs is unclear.

-- The present system of funding postsecondary occupational education does not provide for adequate utilization of private agencies and institutions.

-- Institutions offering postsecondary occupational education lack a national forum for discussing their problems and have no national organization to voice their concerns or promote their interests as they strive to serve the nation's educational needs.

Priorities

-- The question of Congressional emphasis being programmatic or institutional must be resolved.

-- AVA should strengthen its effort to provide services and direction to postsecondary occupational education programs.

-- Some compatible system of funding should be established for both public and private agencies which do or could utilize funds for postsecondary occupational education.

Recommendations

Directed to AVA:

-- AVA should support programmatic emphasis in drafting legislation for postsecondary occupational education.

-- To provide for a unified voice and mutual national support, AVA should take action to provide for institutional membership for postsecondary occupational education institutions within the AVA.

REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

C. Nelson Grote
Past President
American Vocational Association and
Dean, School of Applied Sciences and Technology
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky 40351

It was a personal privilege to be invited to preside at this National Postsecondary Seminar and to be associated with distinguished program participants on the platform and in the audience. It is at the request of the seminar planning committee that I submit a brief statement, in lieu of an oral summary that was to have concluded the format of the seminar. Perhaps with the lapse of time and the opportunity to review the papers presented from the podium and the reports of the group recorders, I will be at least better prepared, if not productive, in providing some personal reflections and conclusions.

It is clear that whenever we address ourselves to the broad question of developing human resources in a democratic society and relating the needs of people to the ever-changing job requirements of a technological, social, and economic base, we are discussing a gigantic problem--one that is fundamental to our survival as an industrial nation and one that is basic to the tenets of our way of life. Not only are the parameters of the problem infinite; the variables are becoming more numerous and complex. These basic assumptions lead me to believe that human resources development will be given higher and higher priorities by more and more agencies, both public and private. The day is gone when any <u>one</u> type of institution, or any <u>one</u> field of service, or any <u>one</u> professional association can assume full responsibility for and control over vocational-technical education, however it may be defined.

Rather, we find ourselves in an educational arena where the "managing of our turf" sometimes means defensive as well as offensive action. The "right of eminent domain"--the right to "take over" educational "property" from previous owners--and the question of jurisdiction and action through concurrence and assurances have become new rules in ever-changing relationships and interactions.

This problem is compounded by changes that are taking place in curriculum development, for example, in vocational-technical education throughout this nation. It is evident that we are not talking about secondary education programs serving primarily juniors and seniors in high school; nor are we limiting our concern to any age group, e.g., above 14 or 16 or below 65. Rather, we have seen "vertical curriculum" develop within the institutional setting, beginning with the kindergarten and proceeding into postsecondary career-oriented curricula. We are not just interested in those "in-school youth"; we are becoming increasingly concerned with the dropouts or "stop-outs" who have left the formal school setting. We are not primarily concerned with the rural areas, but rather with an urban and suburban constituency. Whereas terminal education was no handicap only a half-century ago in a society characterized by technological change, human obsolescence can only be prevented, or at least arrested, by continuing education.

The ever-widening of our curricular offerings (horizontal development) is evidenced by the diversity and broad range of offerings and educational experiences required to match changing job requirements and conditions--new and emerging technological developments, social requirements, and national priorities. Again, it must be concluded that the horizontal program development, when added to the vertical program development, simply compounds our difficulty in "turf management," raises the probability of conflict, and necessitates a re-alignment of resources and re-scheduling of priorities.

We are long overdue, as individual professionals and as members of professional associations, in dealing adequately and effectively with the question of articulation. This is especially true in the field of postsecondary education and, more specifically, in occupational or career education. A major recommendation to the American Vocational Association and other interested associations and agencies would be to plan immediately for a national conference on articulation. Perhaps by necessity, the conference would have to be restricted to "Articulation of Postsecondary Occupational Education: Process and Product."

Too often, articulation is only viewed as a product--an end result. This means that as a result of some action,

articulation has been accomplished. In most cases, articulation is achieved by "overpowering" those groups or agencies with whom you wish to articulate. Often this power is made evident through such forms as political clout, status of the department or bureau in the formal hierarchy, the social status of a given type of institution, the image of a profession or occupation, sheer strength of numbers or economic resources, or just "outsmarting" with creative strategies. Discussions often result in arguments over whether the piston is more important than the crankshaft or if the axle is more important that the wheel. We all know that a piston cannot be effective by itself; neither can the axle or the wheel serve its function without the other. Engineers don't conceive a gear box by designing the housing and pouring in a conglomerate of disassociated parts. Neither do they normally fit a molybdenum alloy gear against a lead blank and force an "articulation" with pressure. Yet, each of us could take this mechanical analogy and cite educational examples at the federal, state, and local levels which illustrate the misuse of the principle of meshing together of the various components to bring about a planned function. The future of our great country is too important, the population is sufficiently sophisticated, and the tax payer, while affluent, is too tax burdened to accept our "playing of games" as so-called educational leaders. The choice we have is whether we want to have articulation "forced" upon us from the outside or to take the leadership in shaping the nature and characteristics of the form and substance of a system of articulation. It is the judgment of the writer that articulation in the 1970's is going to be viewed more as a process than a product. We will experience a never-ending development of new relationships and interelationships requiring communication networks, data banks, and concerted efforts on a regional, national, and perhaps international scale, the like of which we have never experienced.

Coordination, communications, decentralization, decategorization, accreditation, and accountability were terms used throughout this seminar that are illustrative of the concept of articulation. In my judgment, the first step was taken by those who envisioned this seminar. Let's not allow their vision to be blurred or their dreams impaired by procrastination. Let's move forward to the time when we can say in gestalt terms that the "whole is greater than the sum of its parts." What better way to apply the concept of configuration than in the reality of postsecondary education and the world of work?

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

Mary P. Allen, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.

Mitchell L. Ammons, Wharton County Junior College, Wharton, Texas

Richard P. Anderson, Rhode Island Junior College, Providence, Rhode Island

Joseph Ayarbe, University of Nevada Technical Institute, Reno, Nevada

Robert G. Backstrom, Merged Area VI Community College, Marshalltown, Iowa

Jack D. Ballard, Nash Technical Institute, Rocky Mount, North Carolina

Melvin L. Barlow, University of California, Los Angeles, California

Walter J. Bartz, Illinois Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Springfield, Illinois

Oran H. Beaty, Area Director Vocational Technical Education, Council Bluffs, Iowa

Everett L. Belote, Illinois Junior College Board, Springfield, Illinois

Carroll Bennett, Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny, Iowa

Merril Berg, Lake Region Junior College, Devils Lake, North Dakota

Robert Bergstrom, Minnesota State Junior College System, St. Paul, Minnesota

David H. Bland, Montgomery Technical Institute, Troy, North Carolina

M. D. Boatwright, Swainsboro Area Vocational Technical School, Swainsboro, Georgia

Howard E. Boudreau, Fayetteville Technical Institute, Fayetteville, North Carolina

James D. Bowling, Muskingum Technical Institute, Zanesville, Ohio

Ben Brewton, Macon Area Vocational-Technical School, Macon, Georgia

Fred J. Brinkman, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Los Angeles, California

Lewis L. Brinson, Ben Hill-Irwin Area Vocational Technical School, Fitzgerald, Georgia

John Broderick, Vanguard Technical Institute, Fremont, Ohio

Dale E. Brooks, Central Kansas Area Vocational Technical School, Newton, Kansas

James L. Burden, Ferris State College, Big Rapids, Michigan

Lowell A. Burkett, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.

Kenneth E. Carl, Williamsport Area Community College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania

Lewis Case, Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon

James W. Clark, Walters State Community College, Morristown, Tennessee

John S. Clark, Ouachita Valley Technical Institute, West Monroe, Louisiana

Donald Cogdill, Ferris Post, St. Petersburg, Florida

Sidney N. Collier, Orleans Area Vocational Technical School, New Orleans, Louisiana

Harold K. Collins, Durham, North Carolina

Richard Collins, State Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education, Monpelier, Vermont

Melvin Cotrell, Butte, Montana

James A. Cross, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Charleston, West Virginia

Michael Cullen, Willmar Technical Institute, Willmar, Minnesota

Richard Dagg, Vanguard Technical Institute, Fremont, Ohio

Raymond M. Deming, Chipola Junior College, Marianna, Florida

Walter E. Ditzler, Pima College, Tucson, Arizona

Virginia Dobbs, Technical-Occupational Programs, Eastfield College, Mesquite, Texas

Thomas E. Downey, Missoula Technical Center, Missoula, Montana

William A. Dwyer, Blue Hills Regional Technical Institute, Canton, Massachusetts

Olav R. Enli, Nicolet College, Rhinelander, Wisconsin

Theodore Erickson, Laramie, Wyoming

Lois Farone, Phoenix College, Phoenix, Arizona

D. H. Farrens, South Florida Junior College, Avon Park, Florida

A. P. Fatherree, State Director Vocational Technical Education, Jackson, Mississippi

Marvin Feldman, Director of Program Development, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.

William N. Fenninger, Delmar, New York

Flint, Kansas City Community Junior College, Kansas City, Kansas

Charles I. Foltz, New England Occupational Resources Center, Newton, Massachusetts

Ray Freund, Faribault Area Vocational Technical School, Faribault, Minnesota

Jack Friedman, Community College of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland

Gordon B. Funk, California State College, Los Angeles, California

W. D. Garrett, Baton Rouge Vocational Technical School, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Joe D. Gault, Spartanburg County Technical Education Center, Spartanburg, South Carolina

Harlan E. Giese, Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council, Des Moines, Iowa

Angelo C. Gillie, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

Pelton Goudey, State Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education, Randolph, Vermont

Donald E. Graves, Southeastern Regional School District, South Easton, Massachusetts

Charles F. Green, Warren County Technical Institute, Washington, New Jersey

H. Dean Griffin, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.

C. Nelson Grote, Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky

Harold Grudem, Superintendent, Dakota County Area Vocational Technical School, Farmington, Minnesota

John R. Guemple, Association Committee for Occupational Education and Technical Education, Austin, Texas

Warren F. Haas, Indiana Vocational Technical College, Indianapolis, Indiana

F. S. McCain, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, Georgia

Ronald McCarter, Technical Institute of Alamance, Burlington, North Carolina

Robert L. McKee, Washington Technical Institute, Washington, D. C.

Dean McNenny, Area Vocational Technical School, Sturgis, South Dakota

George Mehallis, Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Florida

Richard J. Metcalf, Flinthills Area Vocational Technical School, Emporia, Kansas

Jack Millican, District School Board of Lake County, Umatilla, Florida

Norman P. Mitby, Madison Area Technical College, Madison, Wisconsin

Ronald F. Moon, Black Hawk College, Moline, Illinois

Lester Morley, Gulf Coast Junior College, Panama City, Florida

Jack S. Mullins, State Committee for Technical Education, Columbia, South Carolina

B. J. Murdock, Texarkana College, Texarkana, Texas

William E. Nagel, Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Springfield, Illinois

Joseph T. Nerden, Department of Industrial and Technical Education, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

Charles Odell, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Wilmot F. Oliver, Ocean County College, Toms River, New Jersey

S. C. O'Neal, J. F. Drake State Technical School, Huntsville, Alabama

Richard H. Hagemeyer, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina

Dana R. Hart, The Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, Washington, D. C.

Robert O. Hatton, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Murle M. Hayden, Kansas Department of Education, Topeka, Kansas

John W. Henry, Jr., Malcolm X College, Chicago, Illinois

H. Robert Hewlett, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Brownsburg, Indiana

Addison S. Hobbs, Washington Technical Institute, Washington, D. C.

Harold H. Hopper, Virginia Western Community College, Roanoke, Virginia

James A. Horton, Wahpeton, North Dakota

Frederic L. Howell, Chipola Junior College, Marianna, Florida

William Bruce Howell, Florida State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Tallahassee, Florida

Jack P. Hudnall, Bristol Community College, Fall River, Massachusetts

Ezekiel Hughes, Jr., Wenonah State Technical School, Birmingham, Alabama

Alton Ice, The Advisory Council for Technical Vocational Education, Austin, Texas

Lloyd J. Jewett, University of Maine at Augusta

Clyde H. Jordan, Jr., Ouachita Valley Technical Institute, West Monroe, Louisiana

Leo Keskinen, Itasca State Junior College, Grand Rapids, Minnesota

Ray M. Kesler, County School District, Morgantown, West Virginia

Earl H. Knebel, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

Robert Knoebel, Bureau of Management Services, Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Robert G. Koons, Iowa Vocational Education Advisory Council, Des Moines, Iowa

William A. Korizek, Helena Vocational Technical Center, Helena, Montana

Elmer L. Kuntz, Elko Community College, Elko, Nevada

John C. Lanz, Harrisburg Area Community College, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Irvin T. Lathrop, California State College, Long Beach, California

Charles J. Law, Jr., Division of Occupational Education, Raleigh, North Carolina

M. G. Linson, Denver, Colorado

Robert W. Leonard, Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, New Jersey

Robert W. LeMay, Jr., Raleigh, North Carolina

Scott A. Marshall, Jefferson State Junior College, Birmingham, Alabama

Quintin A. Martin, Panola College, Carthage, Texas

A. D. Mathison, Milwaukee Area Technical College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Mildred A. Mason, Norfolk City Schools, Norfolk, Virginia

Robert M. Mayo, Hinds Jr. College, Raymond, Mississippi

Robert E. Paap, Catawba Valley Technical, Hickory, North Carolina

George A. Parkinson, Milwaukee Area Technical College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Ernest B. Parry, Forsyth Technical Institute, Winston Salem, North Carolina

Hugh B. Phelps, Virginia Western Community College, Roanoke, Virginia

Lloyd J. Phipps, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Arden Pratt, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.

Charles Radcliffe, Minority Counsel for the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Henry I. Rahn, Jr., Sandhills Community College, Southern Pines, North Carolina

Charles G. Richardson, Western Wisconsin Technical Institute, La Crosse, Wisconsin

Earl Roberson, Carver State Technical Trade School, Mobile, Alabama

Walter Roberts, Skagit Valley College, Mt. Vernon, Washington

Berol L. Robinson, J. S. Metric Study, Newton, Massachusetts

David Schroeder, Dakota County Area Vocational School, Farmington, Minnesota

John Schwetz, West Shore Community College, Scottville, Michigan

Austell O. Sherard, Indiana Vocational Technical College, Indianapolis, Indiana

Sam Shigetomi, State Director, Honolulu, Hawaii

Jerome Shostak, Western Electric Fund, New York, New York

J. B. Simmons, Henderson County Junior College, Athens, Texas

Marion D. Smiley, Trenholm State Trade School, Montgomery, Alabama

James S. Smith, Maryland State Department of Education, Baltimore, Maryland

Warren Sorenson, West Valley College, Campbell, California

Lyle C. Sorum, UND-Williston Center, Williston, North Dakota

Bill G. Spence, Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana

Robert A. Stenger, Kirtland Community College, Roscommon, Michigan

J. Louis Stokes, Utica Junior College, Utica, Mississippi

Thomas C. Stone, Southern State College, Springfield, South Dakota

Ruth Stovall, Home Economics Education, Montgomery, Alabama

Clinton E. Tatsch, Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus, Ohio

Jack E. Tompkins, Texas State Technical Institute, Waco, Texas

Arthur L. Walker, Richmond, Virginia

Charles F. Ward, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

Lowell A. Welsh, Nebraska Vocational Technical Education, Milford, Nebraska

Ronald D. Wilson, Butler County Community Junior College, El Dorado, Kansas

Robert E. Turner, Palos Park, Illinois

Scott Tuxhorn, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

William P. Vaughn, Triplett Technical, Mt. Jackson, Virginia

James C. Wakefield, St. Cloud Area Vocational Technical School, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Richard L. Waldroup, Guilford Technical Institute, Jamestown, North Carolina

C. I. Washburn, Belleville Area College, Belleville, Illinois

Howard D. Waters, Albany, Georgia

Paul K. Weatherly, Delaware Technical and Community College, Dover, Delaware

Warren G. Weiler, Ohio Advisory Council, Worthington, Ohio

Edward L. Weld, Nashville State Technical Institute, Nashville, Tennessee

Carl O. Westbrook, New Mexico State University at Grants, Grants, New Mexico

Harold T. White, The Northeast Mississippi Jr. College, Booneville, Mississippi

Charles O. Whitehead, Memphis, Tennessee

D. H. Whittington, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Natchitoches, Louisiana

Harry J. Wolf, University of Nevada Technical Institute, Reno, Nevada

american vocational association
1510 h street, n.w.
washington, d.c. 20005